

**REMARKS**

In the Official Action, the Examiner withdrew a number of the rejections under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112, but introduced other §112 rejections. In addition, the Examiner maintained the rejections on prior art grounds, but stated that if the claims were amended to recite a finite thickness of the metal oxide film, the rejections may be withdrawn.

By the present Amendment, the claims have been amended to address the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to use the term "metal oxide film" which is consistent with the terminology used in the specification and the claims. Furthermore, claim 2 has been amended to make it clear that the main metal element recited in claim 1 is selected from the defined Markush group. Claim 4 has been amended to recite that the SUS layer and the metal layer both have the metal oxide film. Finally, pursuant to the Examiner's kind suggestion, independent claims 1 and 22 have been amended to recite that the defined metal oxide film has a thickness is at least 25Å and less than 50Å. This recitation is supported by the specification, particularly on page 7, lines 7 *et seq.* As may be seen therefrom, a thickness of at least 25Å enables sufficient heat resistance to be obtained and it will be noted that various Examples in the specification describe metal oxide thicknesses in the currently claimed range and the advantageous results which are obtained thereby. In contrast, Comparative Example 1 which uses a metal oxide film outside the claimed range (i.e., 82Å) provided the disadvantageous results described on page 31.

In view of the amendments to the claims, applicants respectfully submit that the claims fully comply with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §112 and define the present

invention in a manner which is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited prior art. As stated in the Action, the prior art was applied only on the basis that the claims allegedly encompassed a metal oxide film of 0Å. That is clearly not the situation now and in view of the Examiner's statement regarding a finite thickness of the metal oxide film noted above and the substantial advantages which can be obtained therefrom explained and illustrated in the specification, applicants respectfully maintain that the claims are patentable in all regards. Accordingly, applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the subject application, he is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

By: Robert G. Mukai  
Robert G. Mukai  
Registration No. 28,531

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620

Date: February 5, 2007